



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,979	11/11/2003	Bruce H. Alvarez	BUR920030162US1	2978

28211 7590 03/16/2006

FREDERICK W. GIBB, III
GIBB INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW FIRM, LLC
2568-A RIVA ROAD
SUITE 304
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401

EXAMINER

ALLEN, NICOLE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2129

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/605,979

Applicant(s)

ALVAREZ ET AL.

Examiner

Nicole L. Allen

Art Unit

2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/11/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) ¹⁻⁴¹~~8-14~~ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/11/2006</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. *Claims 8-14 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 8-14 are the exact same as claims 1-7. Appropriate correction is required.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. *The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:*

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kipersztok et al. (US Patent No. 6,574,537)

Regarding claims 1, 8, 20, 27, 34, and 41, Kipersztok teaches a computerized method for tracking equipment repair comprising:

receiving an equipment identification of an item of equipment to be repaired from a user (Col. 14, lines 36-39, Fig. 5, Ref. A, B, C; the examiner reads that the mechanic is identifying what equipment needs to be repaired);

providing said user with a list of common problems for said item of equipment and a component hierarchy for said item of equipment (Col. 14, Lines 36-41, Fig. 5D, Fig. 6, Ref. 52; the examiner reads the log book as having a list of common problems)

receiving input from said user in response to said list of common problems and said component hierarchy; and in response to said input from said user (Fig. 6; the examiner reads that the user has inputted a response from the list provided from the log book)

providing said user with detailed information regarding said item of equipment, said detailed information comprising at least one of the number of failures (Col. 9, Lines 21-24, Col. 14, Lines 63-66; the examiner reads the number of suspect components as "failures"), the probability of failure (Col. 5, Lines 29-31), the mean time between failures (Col. 15, lines 45-48; the examiner reads the time required to conduct a test as the mean time between failures because the time to complete a test is the time before another test to be performed on another failure), the occurrence of the most recent failure for each component, and the next expected failure.

Regarding claims 2, 9, 16, 21, 28, and 35, Kipersztok teaches the method in claim 1, wherein said process of providing said user with said component hierarchy includes allowing said user to browse through multiple levels of said component hierarchy and select at least one component from any level of said component hierarchy (Col. 5, Lines 33-38, Fig. 5D, Fig. 6, Ref. 52; the examiner reads the entries in the log book as an component hierarchy because the components can be prioritized based upon likelihood, or time)

Regarding claims 3, 10, 22, 29, and 36, Kipersztok teaches the method in claim 1,

wherein said process of providing said detailed information includes providing detailed information for similar equipment (Col. 9, lines 4-15; the examiner reads that log book can contain results of tests and/or other information dealing with flight deck effects of environmental information)

Regarding claims 4, 11, 23, 30, and 37, Kipersztok teaches the method in claim 1, wherein said detailed information further comprises all successful repairs related to said problem, with the most recent successful repairs being listed first (Col. 15, Lines 32-47; the examiner reads that the tests provided are prioritized by value of information. If the tests value information consists of when the tests were performed how successful the repair was, the log is prioritized)

Regarding claims 5, 12, 17, 24, 31 and 38, Kipersztok teaches The method in claim 1, wherein if no problem is selected by said user, said detailed information comprises all successful repairs matching any component selected by said user (Col. 16, Lines 26-29, Fig. 6, Ref. 80; The examiner reads that since the mechanic document every activity, it is bound for information concerning any failure will already exists)

Regarding claims 6, 13, 18, 25, 32 and 39, Kipersztok teaches the method in claim 1, wherein if no components are selected by said user, said detailed information comprises all successful repairs of major components matching any problem selected by said user (Col. 16, Lines 26-29, Fig. 6, Ref. 80; The examiner reads that since the mechanic document every activity, it is bound for information concerning any major component matching any problem will already exists)

Regarding claims 7, 14, 19, 26, 33 and 40, Kipersztok teaches the method in claim 1, wherein if no components and no problems are selected by said user, said detailed information comprises all successful repairs of major components (Col. 16, Lines 26-29, Fig. 6, Ref. 80; The examiner reads that since the mechanic document every activity, it is bound for information concerning any major component and/or any problem will already exists).

Regarding claim 15, Kipersztok teaches a computerized method for tracking equipment repair comprising:

receiving an equipment identification of an item of equipment to be repaired from a user (Col. 14, lines 36-39, Fig. 5, Ref. A, B, C; the examiner reads that the mechanic is identifying what equipment needs to be repaired);

providing said user with a list of common problems for said item of equipment and a component hierarchy for said item of equipment (Col. 14, Lines 36-41, Fig. 5D, Fig. 6, Ref. 52; the examiner reads the log book as having a list of common problems);

receiving input from said user in response to said list of common problems and said component hierarchy;

in response to said input from said user, providing said user with detailed information regarding said item of equipment (Fig.6; the examiner reads that the user has inputted a response from the list provided from the log book) said detailed information comprising at least one of the number of failures (Col. 9, Lines 21-24, Col. 14, Lines 63-66; the examiner reads the number of suspect components as "failures"), the probability of failure (Col. 5, Lines 29-31), the mean time between failures (Col. 15, lines 45-48; the examiner reads the time required to conduct a test as the mean time

between failures because the time to complete a test is the time before another test to be performed on another failure), the occurrence of the most recent failure for each component, and the next expected failure;

maintaining a database of said detailed information based on repair history input from said user (Col. 16, Lines 26-29, Fig. 6, Ref. 80; The examiner reads that the mechanic document every activity); and calculating said mean time between failures by ignoring repairs where the same problem occurred within a predetermined time of the most recent failure (Col. 15, lines 45-48; the examiner reads the time required to conduct a test as the mean time between failures because the time to complete a test is the time before another test to be performed on another failure which means that a repair is ignored).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicole L. Allen whose telephone number is (571) 272-5830. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Vincent can be reached on (571) 272-3080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 3/10/06
David Vincent
Supervisory Patent Examiner

NLA